

ANNUAL VRS CONSUMER COMPLAINT LOG
June 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011

| SUMMARY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Month/Year | 6/2010 | 7/2010 | 8/2010 | 9/2010 | 10/10 | 11/2010 | 12/2010 | 1/2011 | 2/2011 | 3/2011 | 4/2011 | 5/2011 |
| Total Complaints (N = 40) | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 3 |

| DETAIL | | | | |
|--------|----------------|--|-----------------|---|
| # | Complaint Date | Nature of Complaint | Resolution Date | Complaint Resolution Explanation |
| 1 | 6/8/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – After call ended, customer asked yes/no questions to determine what was heard in the background during the call; VI responded with head nods. VI explained they could only stay connected or on hold for 30 seconds. Customer felt that VI was rude and didn't know the rules and asked for supervisor. Customer then requested both VI and supervisor stay on screen and complained again that VI was rude. Customer then asked to make another call with same VI, who placed call with supervisor plugged in. Afterwards customer requested Customer Service information; this was given along with VI number and supervisor's number. | 6/8/2010 | VI was concerned about remaining connected with customer after outbound portion had disconnected. Customer never contacted or followed up with Customer Service. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 2 | 6/9/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer connected with audio party who spoke in an agitated, fast-paced manner. As call progressed at rapid speed, customer became frustrated and stated “wait a minute” several times, which VI correctly voiced to audio party. Customer was upset about this, berated VI for signing too fast and requested supervisor. VI explained supervisor not available at the moment and offered customer service. Customer responded with expletives, again demanding supervisor. VI stated that if obscenities did not cease, call would be disconnected. Customer continued abusive behavior; VI ended call and contacted supervisor. | 6/9/2010 | VI reviewed call with supervisor, explaining rapid intonation and pace of the audio party and the caller's frustration. Supervisor then alerted Customer Service; no follow up call was received from the customer. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 3 | 7/9/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer unhappy about starting calls with one VI and being transferred to another VI too quickly. Also does not know the interpreter's names and feels there is not enough info provided for customers. | 7/9/2010 | Assured customer on compliance with regulations for VIs remaining on call for at least 10 minutes unless “effective communication” is not occurring, and for VI identification during call. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 4 | 8/6/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Audio party accused customer of being “phony” when VI asked for clarification of a fingerspelled city name, said this couldn't be a relay call since no introduction was made. VI knew introduction was made. Audio party disconnected. Customer asked to redial audio party, so VI requested transfer to second CA. This upset customer, who subsequently took down VI identification and disconnected. | 8/6/2010 | Supervisor questioned VI and determined that call was handled appropriately. VI believes customer was mostly upset with the situation surrounding the call. Customer Service did not receive follow up call from the customer. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 5 | 8/9/2010 | <i>VI Competence and Call Content</i> – Customer made call into conference bridge. VI had problem with bridge accepting the access number provided. Customer accused VI of entering the wrong bridge number on purpose. | 8/9/2010 | Customer did not contact Customer Service; VI provided information on call content to supervisor. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 6 | 8/25/2010 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer was trying to read a phone number being signed (too quickly) by VI during a call. | 8/25/2010 | Requested that customer provide VI number and call date/time so that proper monitoring and follow up could be done. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 7 | 9/27/2010 | <i>VRS Features</i> – Assisted customer with Ojo usage including use of “video muting” | 9/27/2010 | Described how the feature works. <i>Resolved.</i> |

ANNUAL VRS CONSUMER COMPLAINT LOG
June 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011

| | | | | |
|----|------------|---|------------|--|
| 8 | 10/8/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Audio Customer told VI to “just process my [expletive deleted] call” after call rang 10 times and standard script given by VI. Customer said “That’s all you are is a dial tone not someone to ask me questions. I just want to talk to my spouse, redial and just process my call.” VI said nothing and placed call, which rang until customer hung up and disconnected. Same VI immediately got another call from same audio customer. VI placed the call, which again rang with no answer. | 10/8/2010 | VI offered audio customer to speak with supervisor; customer apologized “I had had a very bad day - I am sorry, I was very rude.” Customer did not contact Customer Service. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 9 | 10/27/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer was unhappy VI didn’t immediately give identification number. VI placed call and relayed audio recording that the phone number was not in service. VI disconnected the outbound leg then asked if customer wanted to make another call. Customer was upset VI disconnected. VI again stated the number provided was not in service. Customer kept saying VI should have let customer disconnect. | 10/27/2010 | Customer initially requested VCO upon connection; VI apologized also for initiating call without provision of identification number. Customer did not contact Customer Service. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 10 | 12/8/2010 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer reported VI was rude, ate and drank while call was in process. | 12/8/2010 | Apologized and assured customer that operations supervisor would take corrective action. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 11 | 12/20/2010 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer provided feedback on VI scripts used during initiation of calls, suggested eliminating them all. | 12/20/2010 | Assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 12 | 12/20/2010 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer claimed VI dialed the number provided two times and could not complete the call. Customer called again through a different VI who had no problem completing the call. | 12/20/2010 | Assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for coaching based on VI description provided. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 13 | 1/5/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer called doctor’s office - had never had a problem before. The audio party asked “what, what did you say?” several times and if this call was from “NY state relay or where?” Customer didn’t feel understood from start to finish. | 1/5/2011 | Assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 14 | 1/7/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer said VI did not translate correctly, giving the example of “9” versus “f”. Customer wished that the VI clarified or double-checked before voicing. | 1/7/2011 | Assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 15 | 2/24/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer said an email address provided twice in audio message was spelled differently by the VI both times (no VI identification provided). | 2/24/2011 | VI identification not provided, which made it impossible to follow up on this complaint. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 16 | 2/25/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer unhappy with VI perceived to have a poor attitude and exhibiting “anger and sarcasm”. Customer disconnected and reinitiated call with a different VI. | 2/25/2011 | Apologized and assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 17 | 3/1/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer felt VI did not provide equal access to conversation because didn’t feel could yell back during the call. Customer felt ignored because VI avoided eye contact while relaying audio party’s statements and did not allow customer to interject into conversation. Customer didn’t want to be negative because generally likes and uses Snap!VRS. | 3/1/2011 | VI identification not provided. Still, thanked customer for feedback to be referred to operations supervisor for VI training. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 18 | 3/1/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> -- Customer did not like announcement VIs make when hearing parties call them and suggested change to “Welcome to Snap!VRS, please hold for [name] to answer the call” | 3/1/2011 | Assured customer that feedback would be shared with operations supervisor and management. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 19 | 3/9/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer felt VI did not correctly interpret the call for both the customer and the audio party (family member, who expressed similar concerns to customer). Particular mention was made of VI’s accent and lack of expression. | 3/9/2011 | Apologized and assured customer (a highly satisfied user) feedback would be referred to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |

ANNUAL VRS CONSUMER COMPLAINT LOG
June 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011

| | | | | |
|----|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| 20 | 3/14/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer didn't like VI's signing style and interrupted call in progress to inform VI of this. VI offered to switch to another VI but customer refused. Call completed without further incident. | 3/14/2011 | Customer did not contact Customer Service. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 21 | 3/17/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer stated that VI announced Snap!VRS when explicitly requested not to do so. Customer wants to ensure that all VIs are trained to know that they are <i>not</i> required to announce Snap!VRS if the customer requests such. | 3/17/2011 | Reinforced customer concerns and ensured that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI training. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 22 | 3/17/2011 | <i>VI Competence and Call Procedure</i> – Customer irate about VI not paying attention during call process; VI kept looking around room, did not make adequate eye contact. Customer also was upset VI didn't listen when told "don't transfer this call" - VI went ahead with transfer and customer was disconnected. | 3/17/2011 | Apologized and ensured feedback would be directed to the operations supervisor (history is on file re: customer's Z-340 disconnecting during transfers to different VIs). |
| 23 | 3/19/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer noticed VI misinterpreted some things to audio party that had to be corrected, and recommended receptive skills training for that VI. Customer added that other VIs have done a good job. | 3/19/2011 | Apologized and assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 24 | 3/22/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer expressed concern about "bad attitude" of a particular VI. | 3/21/2011 | Apologized and assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 25 | 3/23/2011 | <i>Customer Service/Technical</i> – Customer was not happy about being third in Customer Service queue. | 3/28/2011 | Apologized for the wait, explained that provision of quality service to every customer is important. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 26 | 3/28/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer suggested wording for incoming calls to their number to announce instead, "Please wait for [name]". Said our greeting is dull, hence the suggested change. | 3/28/2011 | Thanked customer for suggested wording and that feedback would be shared with management. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 27 | 3/28/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer said VI had an "attitude" when placing multiple calls, and informed VI of such. | 3/28/2011 | Customer did not contact Customer Service. VI discussed this with supervisor for constructive feedback. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 28 | 3/28/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer requested that VI not announce and instead ask for a specific person by name. Upon connecting, the VI announced "[name] here." Customer said, "I told you to ask for the specified person." VI then explained that the called party was already on the line, "This is [name], who is calling?" Customer then screamed and swore at VI, "Can't you read, you know you have caller ID, tell them it's me!" | 3/28/2011 | Complaint directed to Customer Service, who then explained to customer the standard procedure for processing of unannounced relay calls. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 29 | 4/5/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer said VI sign skills and expressive capabilities were inadequate (no VI identification number was provided). | 4/5/2011 | Apologized and assured customer that feedback would be brought to attention of operations supervisor; reminded of need for VI identification. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 30 | 4/7/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer felt three different VI switches made during a 10-minute call in progress was not appropriate. | 4/7/2011 | Apologized for switches and assured customer that feedback would be directed to operations supervisor. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 31 | 4/8/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer said VI sign skills and expressive capabilities were inadequate, and that VI appeared to be typing on computer or texting (no VI identification number was provided). | 4/8/2011 | Assured customer that feedback would be brought to attention of operations supervisor; reminded of need for VI identification. <i>Resolved.</i> |

ANNUAL VRS CONSUMER COMPLAINT LOG
June 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011

| | | | | |
|----|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| 32 | 4/8/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer felt VI was getting overly involved in conversation and noticed voicing seemed “off”. | 4/8/2011 | Assured customer that feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 33 | 4/8/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer informed VI at beginning of call that they appeared blurry and dark; asked for transfer to another VI. VI stated, “I’m sorry, I can’t do that, we have to disconnect and you’ll have to call again.” Customer believed this was wrong and knew other providers could transfer. | 4/8/2011 | Assured customer that this feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 34 | 4/11/2011 | <i>Call Procedure</i> – Customer felt VI was inexperienced in handling 911 calls, based on her recent experience and having to instead use a neighbor to place the call. Customer expected VI to automatically request location address information and relay such to 911, recommended VI training to this effect. | 4/11/2011 | Assured customer of standard 911 handling procedures through relay and assured customer that feedback would be shared with operations supervisor for corrective action. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 35 | 4/12/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer felt VI did not have patience and did not relay all of what the audio party said during the call. | 4/12/2011 | Assured customer that this feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 36 | 4/12/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer felt had to clarify too many times before VI correctly understood call content; signs were sloppy. Overall, customer would like a more positive experience. | 4/12/2011 | Assured customer that this feedback would go to operations supervisor for VI coaching. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 37 | 4/19/2011 | <i>Call Procedure/Technical</i> – Customer stated that video froze during call and was disconnected; waited for a call back but there never was one. When customer called back, received notification that was 6th in line. Customer thinks this is outrageous and suggested VIs call back when calls are dropped mid-conversation. | 4/19/2011 | Informed customer this would be brought to the attention of technical team. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 38 | 5/4/2011 | <i>Call Procedure/Technical</i> – Customer was unhappy that when transferred (while using VCO) the VCO feature stops working. It only works with the first person who answers the phone. | 5/16/2011 | Provided new remote, which has since cleared up this technical problem. <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 39 | 5/16/2011 | <i>VI Competence</i> – Customer frustrated with VIs not being able to understand them and asking them to clarify three to four times. | 5/19/2011 | Apologized for frustrating experience (customer has cerebral palsy and is difficult to understand with certainty). <i>Resolved.</i> |
| 40 | 5/19/2011 | <i>Call Procedure/Technical</i> – Customer recommends creation of a profile for each phone number so VIs will have immediate access to customer work/home preferences prior to initiation of calls. Customer relies heavily on VCO at workplace, uses sign when calling from home. Customer recommends VI training on processing 2-line VCO calls. | 5/19/2011 | Thanked customer for feedback to be shared with operations supervisor and management. <i>Resolved.</i> |